Previous references. 1896-7
191
(Sep. Revn.

File No. 35-(96-7)
Serial Nos. 1-2.

Later references.

64

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 — 2

Major Part B. for February 97.

SUBJECT

Remission in favour of Venkatarangaiengar & Sangam Ramanna Toddy-rend Farmers of Heggadedevanakote taluk for 1895-6.

Sl. From, the Exc Commr by no 4260 Exn 247
L. no 3468/245 dt 28.12.96

recommends that under the circumstances herein represented the arrears of Rs 1593-12- due by the Toddy rent Farmers of the Heggadedevankote taluk for the year 95-6 may be remitted as a Special case.

G. R. S. 58

GPB—4,000—4-7-11

512. To, the Exr Commr
the Comptr
No 7295-6 & 11.2.97
Exr 287
Remits the local cess amount
of Rs 1125, referred to above, as
a special cess & the balance
should be recovered as
quickly as possible
Indexed. T. B. Thammenna.

~~CHIEF~~ SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

SECTION S R REVENUE BRANCH.

FILE No. 35-(96-7)

SERIAL No.

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT. Remission for Rs 1593-12-0 in favour of the defaulting Toddy vend farmers of the Heggeddevankote Taluq for the year 1895-96.

LAST REFERENCE. Letter No. 3468/245 dated 28th December 6th January 1897 1896 from the Excise Commissioner recommending the remission of Rs 1593-12 as a special ca

Venkatrangaiengar a Sarpur Ramanna were the Toddy vend farmers of the Heggeddevankote Taluq for 1895-96. They purchased the farm for an annual rental of Rs 19125/- including local cess and ~~after paying~~ at the close of the contract ~~up monthly instalments~~, they were found still in arrears to the extent of Rs 2457-4. ~~From the amounts due~~ Towards the reduction of this

arrear

was ordered to be adjusted
~~another~~ a sum of Rs 875 which
the vend farmers had deposited
on account of the contract for
1896-97 (which was first granted
to them by the Excise Comm^r & ^
afterwards cancelled by
Government), thus leaving
a net balance of Rs 1593-12
to be still recovered from them.

When the arrear was
ordered to be recovered from
them under the rules in force,
the farmers, (Venkatrangaiengar
& Narpur Ramanna) petitioned
the Deputy Comm^r praying
for remission of Rs 3013-13-5
which was ~~said to be~~ the actual loss
said to have been sustained
by them.

The Deputy Comm^r
rejected their application
saying that Govt had nothing
to do whether gained or lost
in their business and against
this order the petitioners appealed
to the Excise Comm^r in Myore
on the following grounds:—

(1) that the amount tendered
by them for 1895-96 was only

(1)

only Rs 18000 including local cess, but as the Dy. Commr ~~had~~ said that he would not give them the contract unless they agreed to pay local cess viz Rs 1125 in addition, they were reluctantly obliged to accept the contract accordingly.

(2) that numerous ~~toddy~~ consumers of toddy were taken away in that year for work on the Kheddas and consequently sales diminished.

(3) that owing to floods in rivers & streams, toddy could not be obtained from the neighbouring taluqs of Nanjangud & Gundlupet on which the Heggeddevankote Taluq depended for its supply of ~~toddy~~.

(4) that they were not allowed to open additional shops & that as the contract for 1896-97 [which had been granted to them was cancelled, they were deprived of the opportunity of

Faint speaking there shd. have been some enquiry in regard to these allegations but neither the Dy. Commr to whose office Kowlle themselves to make an enquiry - both of them base their recommendations on the Contractors accounts which appear to be false which on the object of public complaint is thoroughly supported by the residents who were subsequently Commissioners under numerous petitions. It is a hideous that such recommendations shd. cause, and the Contractors be leaved down to their own free will & choice in levying up to fairs at public auction sales. This shd. be

recovering the large outstandings due to them from their servants &c. with interest at 6½ per cent

The petition was referred to the Deputy Commissioner for report as to whether the applicants were entitled to any remission and he in reply said that the contractors might gain or lose and that if remission be granted in the present instances, similar petitions would be encouraged.

In his subsequent letter no 1410 of 22/12/96 in reply to the Excise Comm'r's letter asking him to ~~report~~ examine the Farmers' ~~as~~ original accounts & report, the Deputy Commissioner reported that, from an examination of the Farmers' accounts, it was evident they actually sustained a loss of Rs 3013-13-5 which is no doubt mainly to unhealthy competition between the two hostile parties in the Taluq.

(6)

The Excise Commissioner (in whose letter under reference a detailed circumstances of the case is briefly narrated)

recommends that the case of the petitioners is one deserving of special concession on the following circumstances :—

(1) that, had it not been for the keen competition of Ranganayar since 1893-94, Govt. would have lost a good deal.

(2) that at the auction sales for 1895-96, the petitioners bid in great excitement owing to unhealthy competition between the two rival parties in the Taluq which fact was already observed by the Excise Commr. in his memo no $\frac{5030}{246}$ 8/9/6/96

paper marked (A)

(3) that the fact of the petitioners having sustained loss is borne out by the extract quoted from the then Deputy Commr. Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar's letter —

" I also understand that owing to Venkatsetty's opposition

opposition, the last years contractors had great difficulty in working their farms & that large arrears are due to them from their sub-contractors"

(4) that the Deputy Commr in his letter no 2203 d/29th May 196 reports that from credible information received, the farmers for 1895-96, sustained loss.

(5) that, as the contract for 1896-97 (which was first granted to them) was cancelled by Govt, they were deprived of the opportunity of recovering arrears due to them from Sub Contractors &c.

(6) that, from the petitioners' accounts on the file, it will be seen that they have actually sustained a loss of Rs 3013-13-5.

Under the above circumstances the Excise Commr further says that, if the Government concur in the views expressed in his letter under reference, he would submit a remission statement for Rs 1593-12 the amount now due by the petitioners.

Submitted for 3rd Jr.

There is a really hard case. Strictly & legally, the farmers are entitled to no relief - But Govt can afford to show some mercy in view of unusual losses

competition -

The amount realised
excluding local cess was
Rs 13·86 lac in 1893-94 &
Rs 14·280 in 1894-95. The
circumstances under
which the latter sum
rose to Rs 19 000 odd in
1895-96 have been
fully stated in the Secy
Comrs report. Both the Dy Comrs
and the Secy Comrs (four) found
themselves compelled to
interfere ~~[illegible]~~ in the
result the Secretary was
in favour of accepting
Rs 18000 inclusive of cess.
Even this was nearly
3000 Rs in excess of the
previous year's highest
bid. It was not the Dy
Comrs wish to insist upon
the payment of local
cess over & above the sum
sum of Rs 18000. The
farmers have clearly
sustained a heavy loss.
Some consideration
seems due to them.
I would not however
go the length of suggesting
that they be granted a
remission either to the

extent of the loss alleged
to have been sustained
by them or to what of the
~~outstanding~~ balance
of Rs 1-5-93-12-11 now out-
standing against them.
In my opinion, we cd
need be demanded from
them over & above the Rs 1125
for which Mr Ricketts
had suggested the Parsi
lent Queen Hen - In other
words, a remission of
Rs 112-5- may be sanctioned
as a special case. The
case is a peculiar one
and there is no precedent
in being drawn into an
encouragement precedent.

23-1-97

This may be drawn attention
to the Dewan. Vide
my remarks on the Office
note 25/1/97

Sent to the Dewan
H.
26-1-97

Remit Rs 1125
under the Cir —
4.2.97

Copy sent
Indent to Jones
before spell
6/2/97

5/2/97

Excise.]

(1)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT. Gl. No. 4460 Ex. No. 249 1896 JAN. 97 DEWAN'S OFFICE.

SECTION 5.92.
FILE NO. 35-96 From
SERIAL NO.

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Secy. to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Depts

Dated 28th December 1896.
Despatched 6th January 1897
Received
General No. 3468
No. 245
Enclosure No. Three.

In reply to

SUBJECT

Recommends that under the circumstances herein represented the arrears of Rs 1593-12 - due by the Toddy Vend Farmers of the Heggaddevankoté taluk for the year 1895-96, may be remitted as a special case.

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

Submitted for orders.
So far as the report goes it does not appear to be sufficient grounds for granting the remission recommended by the Excise Comnr.
As remarked by the Dy Comnr (Vide para 2 of this letter) any remission granted in this case would form an inconvenient precedent.
DD
21/1/97

Nor 7-1-97

It is undoubted that renters have sustained a loss of over 3000 Rs. On strictly technical grounds they have no right to a remission. But it is not on these grounds that they claim it or that the Excise Comnr recommends it. The Petrs' allegation seems to be true, viz that they executed under pressure to pay Local cess in addition; this is evident from the fact that Mr Ricketts advised the acceptance of their bid without extra cess. On the whole, the Petrs' case seems to deserve some consideration, by way of grace.
24/1/97.
L. D. Barrow

11/1/97

Excise Commissioner's Office
Bangalore dated 28th December 1896

No. 3468/245 Sec 3.

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

I have the honor to state that Heggad-devankote' Venkatrangiengar and Sarcar Ramanna, Toddy Vend Farmers of the Heggaddevankote' Taluk for 1895-96, applied to the Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District for a remission equal to the actual loss said to have been incurred by them under certain circumstances over which they had no control; but he gave them an endorsement to the effect that if they had derived profit, it would not have been interfered with; and that if they had sustained loss, none but themselves should bear it. Against this endorsement they appealed to me on the following among other grounds

(1) that the amount they tendered for 1895-96, was Rs 18000 including local cess, but

but as the Deputy Commissioner said that he would not give them the contract unless they agreed to pay local cess on Rs 18000, viz Rs 1125, they were reluctantly obliged to accept the contract accordingly;

(2) that numerous consumers of Toddy were taken away for work on the Kheddahs, and consequently the sales of Toddy diminished;

(3) that owing to floods in rivers and streams, Toddy could not be received continuously from the Gundlepet, Hunsur and Nanjangud Taluks on which the Heggaddevankote taluk is dependent for Toddy;

(4) that as the Government cancelled the contract for 1896-97, which the Excise Commissioner had granted them, they lost the opportunity of recovering their dues from their servants &c and of recouping the losses which they sustained in 1895-96; and

(5) that therefore they have lost altogether Rupees 3013-13-5, excluding outstanding balances.

2. Thereupon I called for the records (herewith submitted) relating to the petitioners' complaint;

complaint, and at the same time request-
-ed the Deputy Commissioner's opinion as
to whether the Petitioners are entitled to
any remission under the circumstances
urged by them. The Deputy Commissioner
in his Yadi. No 218, dated the 17th October 1896
(on the accompanying file) states that the
purchasers at auction sales either gain
or loose; and that if remissions be granted
to any Farmer, others also would apply for
it. But I am of opinion that in really hard
cases some special concession should be
granted; and that the Petitioners' case
is one deserving of such concession as may
be seen from the circumstances hereinafter
mentioned.

3. Venkatasetty who had taken up the
above Toddy Vend Farms in the year 1892-93
for Rs 17000 excluding local cess, secured
them in the following year 1893-94 for only
Rs 13,860 excluding local cess, owing to want
of competition against him.

4. From the results of 1893-94 in his favor
Venkatasetty was evidently led to believe
that there was no body to compete against
him; and therefore he offered only Rs 12000
excluding

excluding local cess at the auction sale for the year 1894-95. The Officer conducting the sale appears to have at once seen Venkatasetty's trick, and encouraged the Petitioners to out-bid him, which resulted in the Farms being confirmed in favor of the Petitioners for Rs 14.280.

x Vide para 5 of Yad no 263, dated the 1st October 1896 from Mr Venkat Row, Assistant Commissioner to the Deputy Commissioner

5. Being jealous of the Petitioners having compelled against him, Venkatasetty threw obstacles to their business, as may be seen from the following extract of the then Deputy Commissioner Mr Rangasawmiengar's letter No. 1929, dated the 30th May 1895:——

> "I also understand that owing
> "to Venkatasetty's opposition, the
> "last years' contractors had
> "great difficulty in working
> "their farms and that large
> "arrears are due to them from
> "their Sub Contractors and
> "Ryadigars."

6. At the auction sales for 1895-96 there was unhealthy competition between Venkatasetty and Rangaiengar, (the father of one of the Petitioners Venkatarangiengar and surety of both the Petitioners), who bid against each other in great excitement, and when

Rangaiengar's

6

Rangaiengar's bid came up to Rs 19.260 ex=
=cluding local cess, Venkatasetty withdrew.
For obvious reasons the Deputy Commissioner
rejected this extravagant bid, and advised
the contending parties to tender reasonable
amounts, when Rangaiengar gave a tender
for Rs 18,000 including local cess, and Venkata
=setty for Rs 18,600 excluding local cess. In
reporting these results, the Deputy Commissioner
stated that as Venkatasetty was a defaulter
not having paid up the arrears due by
him for the years 1892-93 and 1893-94, he
preferred giving the lease of the Farms to
Rangaiengar for Rs 18000 excluding local
cess. My predecessor Mr Ricketts replied
that Venkatasetty's tender should be
rejected as per para 1 of Rule V in Govern
=ment Notification No. 11813 (5) M. R Section
R.F. 238-92' dated the 14th
January 1893, and that even if Rangaienga
would not accept the lease for Rs 18000 ex=
=cluding local cess, he would prefer the
same being confirmed in his favor for
Rs 18000 including local cess, as tendered
by him. The Deputy Commissioner, however

Confirmed

confirmed the lease for Rs 18.000 excluding local cess in favor of Rangaiengar's son Venkataraingiengar and a partner named Ramanna, with Rangaiengar and Chickay Gowda as their sureties. The Petitioners say that they accepted the lease for Rs 18.000 excluding local cess, under pressure, as the Deputy Commissioner said that he would not give it to them for Rs 18.000 including local cess according to Rangaiengar's tender.

7. The Deputy Commissioner has, in his letter No. 2203, dated the 29th. May 1896, (a copy whereof is herein enclosed for reference), reported that it appeared from credible information that the farmers for 1895-96 sustained loss. The Petitioners' statement of receipts and expenditure on the accompanying file, shows that they have incurred loss to the extent of Rs 3013-13-5 excluding the outstanding balances due to them by Ryots &c; which are said to amount to Rs 1450-9-7. I requested the Deputy Commissioner to examine the original Cash Accounts &c kept by the firm in course of their business, and to report the extent

of.

of actual loss sustained by them. The Deputy Commissioner has reported the results of his examination in his letter No. 1410. dated the 22nd instant, a copy whereof is herewith sent, which also shows that the actual loss suffered, amounts to Rs 3013-13-5.

8. The arrears due by the Petitioners and for which their property has been attached, aggregated Rs 2457-4-. Towards the liquidation of this amount the Deputy Commissioner has ordered the sum of Rs 875, which the aforesaid Rangaiengar deposited on account of the lease for 1896-97, (which I had granted him, but which the Government ordered to be given to Venkatasetty in Proceedings No 11031-2 / Pt 2156, dated the 19th June 1896) to be credited to Government. Deducting this amount there is a balance of Rs 1593-12-. including interest, outstanding against the Petitioners. The Petitioners pray for the remission of Rs 3013-13-5 being the loss incurred by them as per their Statement. The Assistant Commissioner in charge of the Heggadevankote taluk in his Yadi No 263, dated

the

the 1st October 1896. (on the accompanying file), states that this prayer is deserving of consideration, and suggests that it may be recommended.

9. Under all the circumstances of the case, I am of opinion that the above outstanding balance of Rs 1593-12-" may be remitted as a special case. If Government concur in my views, a Remission Statement in the prescribed form will be submitted for sanction.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

P. M. Mascarenhas

Excise Commissioner

in Mysore

W.

Encl 5 to K. 1

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Mysore District
Dated Camp Gundalpett
29th May 1896.

No 2203

From.

The Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District

To

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

Sir,

I beg to state that as per Government Notification No 97 dated the 13th April 1896, the right of selling toddy in the Heggadadevankote taluk during the year 1896-97 was sold on the 27th May 1896. The Government Farms realized Rupees 16,197-8-0 for the year 1896-97 against Rs 18020 for the current year inclusive of local cess. The Inam Farms realized Rupees 803-4-0 against Rs 1105-0-0 for the current year. In all 17,000 Rupees were realized against Rs 19,125 of the current year. I am informed that at the Sale for the current year competition between two persons was keen and that therefore

the

the amount rose far beyond the normal figures for the two previous years as can be seen from the margin

year	Amount including local cess.
1893-94	14,726-4-0
1894-95	15,172-8-0
1895-96	19,125-0-0

The individual that obtained the farm for the current year has (it appears from credible information) sustained loss.

The amount offered for the year 1896-97 is higher than those realized for 1893-94 and 1894-95. Therefore the Sale has been confirmed. The names of the joint highest bidders are Sargoor Venkata Setty and Dodde Gowda.

I have the honor &c.

(Signed) B. K. Venkatavaradiengar
Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District

"Copy" M Russell
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

PSV.

12

Deputy Commissioners Office
Mysore District
Dated Mysore 22nd December 1896

No. 1410

Enclosure Vernacular File.

From.

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 2331 dated the 2nd November 1896, requesting me to examine the original accounts of Heggaddevenkote V. Rangaiengar and Sargur Ramannah, joint Shendi Izardars of the Heggaddevenkote taluk for the year 1895-96 and report as to the extent of their actual loss, I have the honor to state that on an examination of the original accounts relating to their Shikmi Saguvali, it appears that the income derived by the Contractors by letting out their Shops on a Sub contract amounted to Rupees 10,532-5-0. The accounts relating to the Shops Kept by them as amani show an income of Rupees 10,225-14-0. Thus the total income for the year 1895-96 amounted

amounted to Rupees 20,756-3—0.
Deducting from this amount, the
actual cost of their establishment
which comes to Rs 4,647—0—5, there
remains a balance of Rs 16,111—2-7
which is the demand for the year
1895—96. The whole collection during
the year, including both the Shikini
and amani Saguvali is Rs 14,660-9-0.
The balance for the year is Rs 1,450-9-7
which has not as yet been recovered.
2. In 1895-96 the toddy farm
was contracted for Rs 19,125 and the
demand for the whole year as
detailed above is Rs 16,111—2-7. From
these two items it is evident that
the contractors have actually suffered
a loss of Rupees 3,013-13-5. Statements
showing these details and compared
with the original accounts are herewith
forwarded for reference. Since 1893-94
there has been a keen competition
between V. Rangaiengar and
Venkata Setty and the contractors
have suffered great loss on account

of

of such a competition. That this is a fact may also appear from paras (1) and (2) of the Excise Commissioner's official Memo No. 5030/246 dated the 9th June 1896. From the 1st Assistant Commissioner's Yadi No 263, dated 1-10-96 it appears that the contractors are really entitled to the remission to the extent of the actual loss sustained by them.

3. The records received with the docket under reference are herewith retransmitted.

I have the honor &c.

(Signed) C. Krishiah
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

"Copy" M. Narasaraja
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

PW.

B

P. Regd
104

3.7.96

17-7-96

N. Venkatarao

No: 392 (Rec: 3) F. No. 102.

Forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Kuppam District, with a request that a copy of the Asst. Commr. Venkatadri's letter referred to in his endorsement No. 6, dated the 2 October 1896, to the Petitioners, may be sent for reference, together with the Deputy Commr's opinion as to whether the Petitioners are entitled to any remission under the circumstances urged by them.

3/10/96

Abkari Inspector

2.

ਦੀ ਅਪੀਲ

ਮਾਣਯੋਗ ਸੈਸ਼ਨ ਜੱਜ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਦੀ ਅਦਾਲਤ ਵਿੱਚ

ਅਪੀਲ ਕਰਤਾ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਇਹ ਅਪੀਲ ਇਸ ਕਰਕੇ ਦਾਇਰ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਸ ਨੂੰ ਮਾਣਯੋਗ ਅਦਾਲਤ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਮਿਤੀ 15.9.95 ਨੂੰ ਸਜ਼ਾ ਸੁਣਾਈ ਗਈ ਸੀ ਜਿਸ ਵਿੱਚ ਉਸ ਨੂੰ ਦੋ ਸਾਲ ਦੀ ਕੈਦ ਅਤੇ 18000/- ਰੁਪਏ ਜੁਰਮਾਨਾ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਜੁਰਮਾਨਾ ਨਾ ਦੇਣ ਦੀ ਸੂਰਤ ਵਿੱਚ ਉਸ ਨੂੰ ਹੋਰ ਛੇ ਮਹੀਨੇ ਦੀ ਕੈਦ ਭੁਗਤਣੀ ਪਵੇਗੀ। ਅਪੀਲ ਕਰਤਾ ਨੂੰ ਇਹ ਸਜ਼ਾ ਇਸ ਕਰਕੇ ਸੁਣਾਈ ਗਈ ਸੀ ਕਿ ਉਸ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੀ ਪਤਨੀ ਦੇ ਕਤਲ ਦੇ ਦੋਸ਼ ਵਿੱਚ ਉਸ ਨੂੰ ਦੋਸ਼ੀ ਪਾਇਆ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ। ਅਪੀਲ ਕਰਤਾ ਨੂੰ ਇਹ ਸਜ਼ਾ ਇਸ ਕਰਕੇ ਸੁਣਾਈ ਗਈ ਸੀ ਕਿ ਉਸ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੀ ਪਤਨੀ ਦੇ ਕਤਲ ਦੇ ਦੋਸ਼ ਵਿੱਚ ਉਸ ਨੂੰ ਦੋਸ਼ੀ ਪਾਇਆ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ। ਅਪੀਲ ਕਰਤਾ ਨੂੰ ਇਹ ਸਜ਼ਾ ਇਸ ਕਰਕੇ ਸੁਣਾਈ ਗਈ ਸੀ ਕਿ ਉਸ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੀ ਪਤਨੀ ਦੇ ਕਤਲ ਦੇ ਦੋਸ਼ ਵਿੱਚ ਉਸ ਨੂੰ ਦੋਸ਼ੀ ਪਾਇਆ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ।

2. ਅਪੀਲ ਕਰਤਾ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਇਹ ਅਪੀਲ ਇਸ ਕਰਕੇ ਦਾਇਰ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਸ ਨੂੰ ਮਾਣਯੋਗ ਅਦਾਲਤ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਮਿਤੀ 15.9.95 ਨੂੰ ਸਜ਼ਾ ਸੁਣਾਈ ਗਈ ਸੀ ਜਿਸ ਵਿੱਚ ਉਸ ਨੂੰ ਦੋ ਸਾਲ ਦੀ ਕੈਦ ਅਤੇ 18000/- ਰੁਪਏ ਜੁਰਮਾਨਾ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਜੁਰਮਾਨਾ ਨਾ ਦੇਣ ਦੀ ਸੂਰਤ ਵਿੱਚ ਉਸ ਨੂੰ ਹੋਰ ਛੇ ਮਹੀਨੇ ਦੀ ਕੈਦ ਭੁਗਤਣੀ ਪਵੇਗੀ। ਅਪੀਲ ਕਰਤਾ ਨੂੰ ਇਹ ਸਜ਼ਾ ਇਸ ਕਰਕੇ ਸੁਣਾਈ ਗਈ ਸੀ ਕਿ ਉਸ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੀ ਪਤਨੀ ਦੇ ਕਤਲ ਦੇ ਦੋਸ਼ ਵਿੱਚ ਉਸ ਨੂੰ ਦੋਸ਼ੀ ਪਾਇਆ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ। ਅਪੀਲ ਕਰਤਾ ਨੂੰ ਇਹ ਸਜ਼ਾ ਇਸ ਕਰਕੇ ਸੁਣਾਈ ਗਈ ਸੀ ਕਿ ਉਸ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੀ ਪਤਨੀ ਦੇ ਕਤਲ ਦੇ ਦੋਸ਼ ਵਿੱਚ ਉਸ ਨੂੰ ਦੋਸ਼ੀ ਪਾਇਆ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ।

ਅਪੀਲ ਕਰਤਾ

22.9.95

164

4 1/4

ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ: ಅಪಘಾತದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾವನ್ನಪ್ಪಿದ ಕಾರಣ ಮರಣೋತ್ತರ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಮರಣ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಪತ್ರ ನೀಡಲು ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಮೃತನ ಶವವನ್ನು ಪೋಷಕರಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

24-6-95 ರಂದು

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಸಬ್ ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್

ಸುಂಕದ ಕೆಲಸಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕೆ-ರ-ಭಿ-ಅಮಲ್ದಾ-

27-6-95 ರಲ್ಲಿ- ಸುಂಕದ ಕೆಲಸಿ

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕೆ-ಸಲ್ಲುವ ಅ ಕ-ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೆ.ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣಗೌಡರ

ಅವರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

ಮೇಲ್ಗಡೆಯವರ ಕೆಲಸಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕೆ-164 ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ

ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾದ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನಾ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ ದಂಗು ಕೆ-ಲ-ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರವರ ಕ-ಲಸಿ

ಪ್ರಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡಾ ಆಜ್ಞೆ ಆಯಿತು ಕ್ರ ನೆ

ಮೇಲ್ಗಡೆಯವರ ಕೆಲಸಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಸನ್ 1895-96 ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ ತೆರಿಗೆ

ಸುಂಕ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಣೆ - ರಂಗಸ್ವಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಅ) - ತಾಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂತೆ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್

ಗಳು - ಸುಂಕ ಸಂಗ್ರಹ ಮಾಡಿ ಅಂಚೆಯವರಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಹಣವನ್ನು

15 ದಿವಸದೊಳಗೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು ಕ್ರಮ - ಆದರೆ ಅವರು

ಸೈನ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಮಲ್ದಾರ್ ಕೆಲಸದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾಗ ಕೆ-ಅಲ್ಲಿ - ರಂಗಸ್ವಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಅ) ರವರು

ಕೆ ತಾಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಸುಂಕ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು ರೂ 2000

ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೆ-ಇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ - ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಾಗಿ

ಹೇಳಿ - ಕೊಡದೆ ಇದ್ದು ಕೆಲಸದಿಂದ ತೆಗೆ

19.7.95

26-7-1895

2679

Regd no. 22
19.6.95

Regd No: 11
6.7.98

Rec
5/7/95

[illegible]

4- [illegible]

5. [illegible]

6. [illegible]

Dy/Commissioner
Anantapur Dist.

21668

No 5030/246

Excise Commissioner's office
Bangalore 9th/10th June 1896

Official Memorandum

Read:— Correspondence ending with docket No: 2284 dated the 4th June 1896, from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar district.

Venkatasetty tendered Rs 17,000 excluding local cess for the Toddy and Farms in the Heggadidevenkota taluk, for the year 1892-93, and the special officers who conducted the sales for that year, Confirmed the farms to him for the above amount, no higher bids having been received.

2. At the sales for 1893-94, Venkata Setty secured the farms for Rs 13,860 — excluding local cess, apparently owing to want of competition against him.

3. At the sales for 1894-95, it would appear that Venkatasetty offered only Rs 12,000 excluding local cess and that no one outbid him. The officer conducting the sale, seeing that Venkata Setty had managed to secure the farms for a very low figure since 1893-94, for want of competition against him, appears to have procured a competitor in the person of Rangaiengar, the current year's farmer, who outbid him up to Rs 14,280 excluding local cess, for which amount the farm was knocked down to Rangaiengar.

4. At the sales for 1895-96, there was factious competition between Venkatasetty and Rangaiengar, who bid against each other in great excitement, and when Rangaiengar's bid came up to Rs 19,260 excluding local

amount was abnormally high, the Deputy Commissioner did not close the sale, but applied for the Excise Commissioner's orders. The Excise Commissioner called the Deputy Commissioner's attention to the rule that the officer conducting the sale shall not be bound to accept the highest bid should he consider it to be so extravagantly high as to afford apprehension of the lease breaking down

5. The Deputy Commissioner then had the rival parties before him, and explained to them that their bids should not be swayed by rivalry and advised them to tender reasonable amounts. When Rangaiengar gave a tender for Rs 18,000 including local cess and Venkatasetty for Rs 18600/- excluding local cess. In reporting these

these results to the Excise Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner stated that Venkatasetty was a defaulter in not having paid up the arrears due by him for 1892-93 and 1893-94 and that he therefore preferred giving the farms to Rangaiengar for Rs 18,000/- excluding local cess. The Excise Commissioner replied that since Venkatasetty was a defaulter, his bid should be ~~reconsidered~~ rejected as per para 1 of Rule V in Government Notification No: 11813/RT-233-92, dated the 14th January 1893 and that the farms should be given to Rangaiengar. Accordingly the Deputy Commissioner confirmed the farms in favor of Rangaiengar for Rs 18,000 exclusive of local cess.

6. At the sales for 1896-97, Venkatasetty offered Rs 17,000 including local cess. The current year's farmer Rangaiengar

requested

3/ requested the Deputy Commissioner to continue the farm to him 1896-97 for the amount offered by Venkatasetty. The Deputy Commissioner wanted him to bid for the farms at the sale, but he would not do so for fear that it should result in unhealthy competition tending to subject him to further losses. Thereupon the Deputy Commissioner confirmed the sale in favor of Venkatasetty for Rs 17,000 including local cess. Against this order of the Deputy Commissioner, Rangaiyar appealed to the Excise Commissioner, and prayed that the farm be continued to him for 1896-97 to save him from ruin and stated that he was even willing to pay Rupees five hundred more than Venkatasetty. Thereupon the Deputy Commissioner was informed that Petitioners case deserved reconsideration

so that in the absence of unobjectionable competition, he might get the farm for a reasonable amount the settlement of which was left to the Deputy Commissioner. In reply, the Deputy Commissioner states that as the Petitioner had every opportunity to bid at the sale, and as he did not do so, he is of opinion that his present offer should be rejected, as otherwise the sales will have no finality.

7. The Excise Commissioner is, however, of opinion that the offer of Petitioner Rangaiengar, the current year's farmer, viz Rs (17,500) Seventeen thousand & five hundred inclusive of local cess should be accepted in preference to Venkatasetty's offer of Rs 17,000/ Seventeen thousand including local cess on the following grounds:—

(1) that it is a fact as ascertained

and

and stated by the Deputy Commissioner himself that Rangaccigar, the current year's farmer, has sustained a loss for 1895-96;

(2) that if the farms be not continued to him for 1896-97, he would lose further, not being able to recover his dues from Cadigars &c, and would naturally clamor for remission of Kists;

(3) that Venkataselly being a defaulter, his bid should not be accepted under the standing rules, as ruled last year by the then Excise Commissioner Mr. Ricketts;

(4) that it appears from what the Petitioner has stated, that Venkataselly failed to pay the whole of the prescribed deposit in proper time; and

(5) that as laid down in the Excise Commissioner's circular No: 4446-50/133 dated the 18th February 1893, the sale is subject to the Excise Commissioner's

orders

...Kataretty's offer of Rs 17,...
...including local cess being less th...
the current year's amount by Rs ...
8. Accordingly, it is ordered that ...
Petitioner Rangaiengar's offer of Rs 17,...
including local cess for 1896-97 be, a...
is hereby accepted, Venkatasetty's bid ...
of Rs 17,000 inclusive of local cess, being ...
rejected. The lease should be registered, ...
as in the current year, in the names of ...
Rangaiengar's widow Venkataraugaiengar ...
and Ramanna.

(Signed) P. N. Purnaiya
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

27/23
5-1

II
Copy of the above is forwarded to the ...
Amildar of Heggadevankote, ...
for information and guidance.

14.6.96

19-6-96

19-6-96

ਦਿਨਾਂਕ 16.9.96

ਸੇਵਾ ਵਿਖੇ ਸ੍ਰੀਮਤੀ ਸੁਰਿੰਦਰ ਕੌਰ ਬਾਜਵਾ

ਸਕੱਤਰ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਰਾਜ ਮਹਿਲਾ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ

ਚੰਡੀਗੜ੍ਹ

ਵਿਸ਼ਾ :- ਸ਼ਿਕਾਇਤ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਸ੍ਰੀਮਤੀ ਕੁਲਵੰਤ ਕੌਰ ਪਤਨੀ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਸੁਰਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਮੁਹਾਲੀ ਤਹਿ: ਖਰੜ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਰੂਪਨਗਰ ਵਿਰੁੱਧ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਸੁਰਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁੱਤਰ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਬਚਨ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਮੁਹਾਲੀ ਤਹਿ: ਖਰੜ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਰੂਪਨਗਰ ਅਤੇ ਹੋਰ।

ਮੈਮੋਰੰਡਮ ਨੰ. 2156 ਮਿਤੀ 11.10.96 ਦੇ ਸਬੰਧ ਵਿੱਚ।

ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਵਿਸ਼ੇ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਸ੍ਰੀਮਤੀ ਕੁਲਵੰਤ ਕੌਰ ਪਤਨੀ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਸੁਰਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਮੁਹਾਲੀ ਤਹਿ: ਖਰੜ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਰੂਪਨਗਰ ਵਿਰੁੱਧ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਸੁਰਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁੱਤਰ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਬਚਨ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਮੁਹਾਲੀ ਤਹਿ: ਖਰੜ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਰੂਪਨਗਰ ਅਤੇ ਹੋਰ ਦੀ ਸ਼ਿਕਾਇਤ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਮੈਮੋਰੰਡਮ ਨੰ. 2156 ਮਿਤੀ 11.10.96 ਰਾਹੀਂ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ ਜਿਸ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਮੈਮੋਰੰਡਮ ਨੰ. 2156 ਮਿਤੀ 17.10.96 ਰਾਹੀਂ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਸੁਰਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁੱਤਰ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਬਚਨ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਮੁਹਾਲੀ ਤਹਿ: ਖਰੜ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਰੂਪਨਗਰ ਅਤੇ ਹੋਰ ਨੂੰ ਰਿਪੋਰਟ ਭੇਜਣ ਲਈ ਲਿਖਿਆ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਸੁਰਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁੱਤਰ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਬਚਨ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਮੁਹਾਲੀ ਤਹਿ: ਖਰੜ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਰੂਪਨਗਰ ਅਤੇ ਹੋਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਆਪਣੀ ਰਿਪੋਰਟ ਮਿਤੀ 22.9.96 ਰਾਹੀਂ ਭੇਜੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ ਜਿਸ ਵਿੱਚ ਉਹਨਾਂ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਲਿਖਿਆ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਹਨਾਂ ਦੇ ਵਿਰੁੱਧ ਸ੍ਰੀਮਤੀ ਕੁਲਵੰਤ ਕੌਰ ਪਤਨੀ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਸੁਰਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਮੁਹਾਲੀ ਤਹਿ: ਖਰੜ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਰੂਪਨਗਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਗਈ ਸ਼ਿਕਾਇਤ ਝੂਠੀ ਅਤੇ ਬੇਬੁਨਿਆਦ ਹੈ। ਉਹਨਾਂ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਸ੍ਰੀਮਤੀ ਕੁਲਵੰਤ ਕੌਰ ਪਤਨੀ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਸੁਰਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਮੁਹਾਲੀ ਤਹਿ: ਖਰੜ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਰੂਪਨਗਰ ਵਿਰੁੱਧ ਕੋਈ ਕੇਸ ਦਰਜ ਨਹੀਂ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਨਾ ਹੀ ਉਹਨਾਂ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਕੋਈ ਕੇਸ ਦਰਜ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ। ਉਹਨਾਂ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਸ੍ਰੀਮਤੀ ਕੁਲਵੰਤ ਕੌਰ ਪਤਨੀ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਸੁਰਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਮੁਹਾਲੀ ਤਹਿ: ਖਰੜ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਰੂਪਨਗਰ ਨੂੰ ਕਦੇ ਵੀ ਤੰਗ ਪ੍ਰੇਸ਼ਾਨ ਨਹੀਂ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਅਤੇ ਨਾ ਹੀ ਉਹਨਾਂ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਕੋਈ ਦਾਜ ਦੀ ਮੰਗ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ। ਉਹਨਾਂ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਸ੍ਰੀਮਤੀ ਕੁਲਵੰਤ ਕੌਰ ਪਤਨੀ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਸੁਰਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਮੁਹਾਲੀ ਤਹਿ: ਖਰੜ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਰੂਪਨਗਰ ਨੂੰ ਕੋਈ ਸੱਟ ਫੇਟ ਵੀ ਨਹੀਂ ਮਾਰੀ ਗਈ ਅਤੇ ਨਾ ਹੀ ਉਹਨਾਂ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਕੋਈ ਕੁੱਟਮਾਰ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕಂದಾಇ 675 ಭೂಕಂ 96

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ದಿನಾಂಕ: 18.9.1996

ಸಂಪುಟ ಸಭೆಯ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದಂತೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ 1964 ರ ಕಲಂ 4 ರ ಉಪಕಲಂ (1) ರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕಂದಾಇ 2451-ಕ-ಭೂಕಂ-95 ದಿನಾಂಕ 1.8.1995 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಡ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸಕ್ಷಮ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಿಯವರು ಕಲಂ 5 ಎ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಆಲಿಸಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಅಧಿಸೂಚಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಭೂಮಿಯ ವಿವರ

ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

15/3-12-0

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ:

ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಶ್ರೀ

ವಿಷಯ: ಸಾಲ ಮಂಜೂರಾತಿ ಕುರಿತು.

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ನಾನು ಕೃಷಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸಾಲ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸಿದ್ದು, ಸಾಲ ಮಂಜೂರಾತಿಗಾಗಿ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿರುವ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ಲಗತ್ತಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಸಾಲ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಕೋರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇಂತಿ ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ,

ಸ್ಥಳ:

ದಿನಾಂಕ:

F. No. 95

ವಿಷಯ: ಶ್ರೀ ಸ ಪಟೇಲ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಾಧ್ಯಾಪಕರು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಕ-2 ಶೀರ್ಷಿಕೆಯ ಕಡತ.

ಮೇಲಿನ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಕಡತವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದಾಗ ಕಂಡುಬಂದ/ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತೆ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆ.

(1) ಶ್ರೀ ಸ ಪಟೇಲ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಾಧ್ಯಾಪಕರು ಇವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಪ್ರಥಮ ದರ್ಜೆ ಕಾಲೇಜು ಹಾಗೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಪದವಿ ಪೂರ್ವ ಕಾಲೇಜು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಾಧ್ಯಾಪಕರಾಗಿ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಿದ್ದು ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು.

(2) ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು.

(3) ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು.

(4) ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು.

2 ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು.

3 ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು.

(5) ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪದವಿ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು.

SECTION S.R.
FILE 35-3½-7
SER

(2) 1/6

Read:
Letter from the Ln: Commr No 3466 dd 245
dd 20 Decr 96 + recommending the
remission of Rs 1593-12-0, in favr
of Venketrungadyengar and Sargu
Ramanna, Toddy Vend Farmers of
Heggadadevencote Taluk for the year 95-6

Rde thereon:- No 7295-96 dd 11/2/97
Ex 1287 15-2-97,

The Excise Commr recommends
the remission ₹, in favr of
Venkatrangiengar and Sargu Ramanna
Toddy Vend Farmers of the Heggada-
devenkote Taluk for 1895-96, of
the balance of Rs 1593-12-0 still
due from them.

2. The circumstances under
which ~~such a heavy balance became~~ the bids ~~for~~ ran up to
more than Rs 19000, under the
influence of unwholesome competition, have been fully stated in
the Ln: Commrs report. Mr Ricketts
was finally in favr of accepting
Rs 18000 inclusive of local cess
from Venkatrangiengar and
Ramanna, ~~the~~ that amount being
nearly 3000 Rs in excess of the
previous year's highest bid -
~~It is to be regretted that, instead~~
~~of accepting that amount~~
the Dy Commr ~~should have insisted~~
upon the payment of local
cess in addition.

3. It is certain that the farmers have sustained a heavy loss, owing to diminished sales, the difficulty of transporting liquor and the loss of the contract for the present official year. They themselves estimate it at over three thousand rupees. On this point, however, enquiry should have been made by the Dy. Commr. and the Asst. Commr., instead of relying implicitly on the farmers' own accounts. It is hoped that this will be done in all future cases.

4. Strictly speaking, therefore, there are no grounds on which the farmers in this case can claim any relief from the Govt. But considering the circumstances under which their bid was obtained, Govt. are pleased, as a special case, to remit the local assessment of Rs. 1125, referred to above. The balance should be recovered as quickly as possible.

11-2-97.

11-2-97.

2 pm 11-2-97

To
The Excise Commr.
& Comptroller.

In consideration of the circumstances stated in para 3 of the letter, Govt. are pleased to remit the local assessment of Rs. 1125 referred to above.

3. Govt observe that as a rule all farmers must be guided by their contract & no remission can be claimed by them, or accorded to them, on the ground of loss.